

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 10/21/98 09/176,124 SCHNEIDER 10191/857 Gi **EXAMINER** Г IM62/0703 KENYON & KENYON TUNG, T ONE BROADWAY PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT NEW YORK NY 10004 1743 **DATE MAILED:** 07/03/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	I Annlingting No.	Applicant/	P 1	
·· ·	1	Application No. Applicant(s) 99/176/124 SCHNEIDER ETAL		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	1	Group Art Uni	
	(.	TUNG	1743	Pyen No.
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sl	neet beneath the	e correspondence	address
Period for Reply		3 MONTH		,
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	∠MONTI	H(S) FROM THE M	IAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defau Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta 	reply within the statutor	y minimum of thirty HS from the mailing	(30) days will be consi date of this communi	dered timely. cation .
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5-22	-00			· ·
This action is FINAL.				
 Since this application is in condition for allowance excelled accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19 	ot for formal matters 035 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.	, prosecution as G. 213.	s to the merits is	closed in
Disposition of Claims				
\bigcirc Claim(s) $1-7$			is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)				
□ Claim(s)				
Claim(s) (-7				
☐ Claim(s)		is/a		
□ Claim(s)		are	e subject to restrict quirement.	ion or election
Application Papers		,		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw	. D : DTO 04	8.		•
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ appr	oved 🗆 disappr	oved.	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objection.	is □ appr	oved 🗆 disappr	oved.	
 ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ appr ected to by the Exan	oved 🗆 disappr	oved.	
 ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ appr ected to by the Exan	oved 🗆 disappr	oved.	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objute to by the Examiner. ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	is □ appr ected to by the Exan	oved □ disappr niner.	oved.	
 ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ apprected to by the Examulation	oved □ disappr niner. 1 9(a)-(d)	oved.	
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected by the Examulation	oved □ disappr niner. 1 9(a)-(d) ents have been	· .	
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to be apprected in the priority documents and the priority documen	oved	· (a)).	
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to be apprected in the priority documents and the priority documen	oved	· (a)).	
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to be a second in the priority documn in the priority documn is □ apprected in the priority documn in the priority documn is □ apprected in the priority documn is □ appre	oved	· (a)).	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to by the Examulation is □ apprected to be a second in the priority documn in the priority documn is □ apprected in the priority documn in the priority documn is □ apprected in the priority documn is □ appre	oved	(a)).	

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

Art Unit: 1102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is still unclear what exactly is being claimed by applicant. Are the claims drawn to a final product of a sintered sensor element? If so, to what is claim 3 drawn? What is the final product being recited in claim 3? Is that final product different from the pre-sintered product?

Claim 1, line 5, it is not evident which element is the "cover layer". From applicant's discussion, it would appear that element 32 is intended. However, the specification at page 3, line 15 refers to numeral 26 as a "cover layer" and at line 21 refers to numeral 32 as a "covering foil". For the purpose of the prior art rejections to follow, applicant is presumed to mean numeral 32 as the "cover layer".

Claim 1, last two lines, the expression "the layer plane being disposed between the function layer and the cover layer" appears to be redundant in view of wording at lines 6-11 of the claim. Note that the heating conductor is embedded in the heating element, which is arranged in a layer plane. If the heating element is disposed between the function layer and the cover layer, how can the layer plane not also be disposed between the function layer and the cover layer?

This rejection is prompted by applicant's May 22, 2000 response.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada '806 or Yamada '807.

Art Unit: 1102

Applicant argues that the Yamada patents do not anticipate the claims because the heater is not between a function layer and a cover layer.

This argument is not persuasive. In Yamada '806, the lowermost layer or lowermost two layers can be considered the "cover layer" since it certainly covers the function layer (13'a and/or 13'b). That the lowerlmost layer(s) may have electrodes does not disqualify it as a "cover layer". Certainly, applicant's claim language does not exclude the presence of electrodes in the "cover layer".

Similarly, the lowermost layer(s) in Yamada '807 can be considered a "cover layer". As for the contention that the heater in this patent is arranged asymmetrically with respect to the layers of the sensor element, that is seen to be without merit. At least in fig. 5, layers 22 and 26 together have approximately the same thickness as layers 23 and 21. Since the heater is located at the upper surface of layer 23, it is considered to be symmetrical with respect to the layers of the sensor element.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider etal in viw of Yamada '806 or Yamada '807.

Applicant argues that Schneider does not arrange his heater between a function layer and a cover layer.

This argument is not persuasive and appears to contradict the patent's drawings. In Schneider, heater 27 is seen to be clearly between a cover layer 29 and a function layer (14 and/or 22).

Art Unit: 1102

Applicant also argues that none of the references teaches locating the heater in a centered position with respect to the cross-section of the sensor element layers so as to provide a homogeneous distribution of heat.

This argument is also not persuasive. Either Yamada reference is considered to show locating a heater approximately at a centered position with respect to the cross-section of the sensor element layers. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such a location of the heater would minimize throughout the sensor temperature gradients that can cause inaccurate measurement and damage due to thermal stress. Further, the fact that the layers on both sides of the heater in either Yamada may contain electrodes is seen to be irrelevant. The presence of electrodes would not adversely affect the even distribution of heat.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1102

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The examiner can be reached at 703-308-3329. His supervisor Jill Warden can be reached at 703-308-4037. Any general inquiry should be directed to the receptionist at 703-308-0661. A fax number for TC 1700 is 703-305-7719.

Ta Tung

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1743